

City of Greenbelt

Grant Review Panel Report:

**Recommendation to the Greenbelt City Council
Concerning FY 2018 Project and Operating Grant Applications**

April 17, 2017

Background

The Grant Review Panel convened on Saturday, April 15, 2017, to review community group applications for City of Greenbelt project and operating grants in Fiscal Year 2018. Such grants are available to local organizations, at Council's discretion, through the city's Recognition Group program. All five panelists were present for this meeting, including: Jake Chesnutt (PRAB), Henry Haslinger (SCAC), Jamie Krauk (CRAB), Anna Socrates (AAB) and Jeremy Tuthill (YAC). Also present from the Greenbelt Recreation Department were Deborah Coulter, Nicole DeWald and Greg Varda. This meeting was open to the public but no additional guests were in attendance.

In keeping with the Grant Review Panelist Handbook, members evaluated the potential direct and indirect benefits of all proposed activities to the Greenbelt community. Panelists also assessed the applicant organizations' overall strength and their capacity to fulfill their proposals. All applications were scored on a 100 point scale by each panelist. The applicants' average scores are provided below along with a summary of the panelists' comments.

Based on their findings, the Grant Review Panel is recommending grant awards totaling \$81,255 -- \$145 under the budget of \$81,400 specified in the city's FY18 proposed budget. In addition, the panel is providing Council with a "wish list" for supplemental funding for some groups if additional resources are available. Grant Review Panel procedures allow the panelists to recommend supplemental funding of up to 15% of the total proposed Recognition Group budget (\$12,210 for FY18). The panel is recommending \$3,150 in supplemental funding, or \$3,005 (< 4%) above the City Manager's proposed budget for this program.

Recommended Awards

The Grant Review Panel recommends that City Council approve the following awards as part of the FY 2018 municipal budget:

Organization	Recommended Grant Award
Boys to Men Mentoring Network	\$2,150
Center for Dynamic Community Governance	\$3,000
Chesapeake Education, Arts and Research Society (CHEARS)	\$1,500
Friends of New Deal Café Arts (FONDCA)	\$2,500
Greenbelt Aquatic Boosters	\$8,500
Greenbelt Babe Ruth*	2,660
Greenbelt Boys and Girls Club	\$14,620
Greenbelt Concert Band (GCB) *	\$350
Greenbelt Cultural Arts Center (GAC)	\$34,300
Greenbelt Senior Softball*	\$495
Greenbelt Soccer Alliance (GSA)	\$2,580
Greenbelt Youth Baseball	\$8,600
Total recommended awards	\$81,255

** These three organizations requested more funding from the City of Greenbelt than they indicated they were prepared to match through savings or income from other sources. Since groups are required to match city grant awards, the Grant Review Panel considered only the eligible portion of each group's request – ie the amount which they stated they would match.*

Eligible funding requests by the applicant organizations total \$87,500, exceeding the City Manager's proposed budget by \$6,100. In order to stay within the budget, the Grant Review Panel calculated their recommended awards using this formula:

<u>Average Application Score</u>	<u>Recommended Funding (% of Eligible Request)</u>
80 points or above	100%
70-79 points	86%
60-69 points	70%
Below 60 points	55%

The Grant Review Panel's "wish list" for supplemental funding would raise the level of support for applicants scoring 70-79 points up to 100% of their eligible requests.

Please refer also to the spreadsheet appended to this report. The spreadsheet shows the applicant groups' current status and FY17 funding awards, the eligible amounts of their FY 18 funding requests, their application scores, the panel's recommended grant awards, and the panel's recommended supplemental funding as available.

Scores and Comments

Boys to Men Mentoring Network

71 points

Comments: “Great potential impact”; “well-established model”; “limited but feasible expansion plan”; “will serve underserved at-risk population”

Concerns: “No Greenbelt leaders or committed mentors”; “ties to Greenbelt are in the process of being built”; “pilot will only serve relatively small number; how are participants chosen?”; “limited information is provided regarding financial history”

Center for Dynamic Community Governance

81 points

Comments: “financial history seems excellent”; “goal of aiding other organizations seems worthwhile”; “will benefit underserved area”; “dynamic and well trained leaders”

Concerns: “Limited explanation of actual process of project”; “Specifics of training and focus?”; “How to gauge program success?”; “System seems better suited to running meetings than increasing program participation”

Chesapeake Education, Arts and Research Society (CHEARS)

86 points

Comments: “New program, but experienced in environmental programs”; “Not entirely clear how many workshops will be offered – if interest is high will they offer more?”; “The finances appear very good, and the project’s goal of increasing sustainability through education is a good one.”

Concerns: “Is organization spread too thin?”; “Have they gauged community interest?”; “Uncertain of downstream cumulative impact”

Friends of New Deal Café Arts (FONDCA)

86 points

Comments: “Great opportunity for community members to come out and enjoy high-quality music”; “It is clear that FONDCA has both the funds and the personnel to carry out these events smoothly”; “Seeking ways to grow and diversify volunteers and board”; “experienced in putting on the Roosevelt Center festivals, and these add value to the center”; “some economic impact with Roosevelt [Center] businesses”; “recovered from loss of former Chair [Barbara Simon]”

Concerns: “Though the activities are quite distinctive, they have little effect on those not participating in them”; “not as much lasting impact as some other projects”; “Need to broaden appeal, age-wise”; “Somewhat vague in describing how full funding will be used”

Greenbelt Aquatic Boosters**80 points**

Comments: “long-established organization”; “benefit to GAFC – memberships and lifeguard pool”; “promote healthy exercise for young people”; “good will ambassadors”

Concerns: “direct impact only?”; “lack of narrative”; “barely half of members are Greenbelt residents”; “limited partnership history”

Greenbelt Babe Ruth**68 points**

Comments: “Very valuable for older kids in Greenbelt to have a more competitive baseball team”; “healthy exercise”; “well established”

Concerns: “The financials are a bit shaky – expenses exceeded income the last two [fiscal years]”

Greenbelt Boys and Girls Club**78 points**

Comments: “wide range of sports”; “ratio of Greenbelt residents to non-residents seems satisfactory across all levels of involvement”; “large resident participation”; “new leadership with positive progress”; “significant number of partnerships”; “long-standing organization”

Concerns: “overlap with other groups?”; “promote and focus on competition over exercise – do all kids get to play?”; “show administrative churn and some financial issues (with 501C3)”

Greenbelt Concert Band (GCB)**60 points**

Comments: “performances reach a very large audience”; “performing at retirement facilities...is a good cause”; “part of Greenbelt’s history and tradition”

Concerns: “largely non-Greenbelt residents”; “none of the board members are Greenbelt residents”; “several concerts in Greenbelt each year, but most of the concerts take place outside of Greenbelt”; “inability to match city funds”; “guidance should be given to fundraise”; “current leadership will not consider ways to comply with the rules”

Greenbelt Cultural Arts Center (GAC)**84 points**

Comments: “diverse, interesting offerings targeting multiple populations”; “well-established, creative, well-organized”; “agile and thoughtful leadership which makes course corrections”; “fundraising power – raised \$125,000 over ten years for capital improvements”; “diversity of income beneficial”; “great partners – S.O.M.E., Community Forklift”

Concerns: “The center ended the last fiscal year with a deficit, although the factors contributing to the loss were weather-related and arguably unavoidable”; “declining number of volunteers”; ability to grow their audience

Greenbelt Senior Softball**47 points**

Comments: “Promote healthy exercise for seniors”; “established program”

Concerns: “Not many residents participate”; “Most spectators are family members, i.e. not Greenbelt residents”; “benefit to non-participants is rather low”; “did not provide all required responses [on their application]”; “No other fundraising efforts”; “collaboration with other entities?”

Greenbelt Soccer Alliance (GSA)**77 points**

Comments: “letters of support”; “myriad partners”; “\$ used directly for discounts to Greenbelt residents”; “do one thing really well”; “very inclusive and collaborative”; “focus on exercise”

Concerns: “volunteer and retention challenges”; “had expenses over income last year, though they have a decent checking account balance”

Greenbelt Youth Baseball**75 points**

Comments: “Good opportunity for children to exercise regularly and a good opportunity for the community to come and [watch] sporting events”; “lots of participants”

Concerns: “Volunteer retention”; “not many partners”

This report was compiled by the Greenbelt Recreation Department on behalf of the Grant Review Panel, based on the panelists’ score sheets.

City of Greenbelt
Fiscal Year 2018 Recognition Group Grant Requests
Application Scores and Panel Funding Recommendations

PROJECT GRANTS

Organization/ Project	Current Status	FY17 City Funding	Average Score	Funding Request (eligible portion)	Funding Recommendation	Wish List Recommendation
Boys to Men Mentoring (GMS)	Recognition Group	\$0	71	\$2,500	\$2,150	\$350
Center for Dynamic Community Governance (Greenbriar/CARES/GAIL)	Recognition Group	\$0	81	\$3,000	\$3,000	
Chesapeake Education, Arts and Research Society (organic land care)	Recognition Group	\$0	86	\$1,500	\$1,500	
Friends of New Deal Cafe Arts (music festivals)	Contribution Group	\$2,500	86	\$2,500	\$2,500	
Subtotal, project grants		\$2,500		\$9,500	\$9,150	\$350

OPERATING GRANTS

Organization	Current Status	FY17 City Funding	Average Score	Funding Request (eligible portion)	Funding Recommendation	Wish List Recommendation
Greenbelt Aquatic Boosters	Contribution Group	\$8,500	80	\$8,500	\$8,500	
Greenbelt Babe Ruth	Contribution Group	\$5,500	68	\$3,800	\$2,660	
Greenbelt Boys & Girls Club	Contribution Group	\$15,300	78	\$17,000	\$14,620	\$2,380
Greenbelt Concert Band	Contribution Group	\$4,600	60	\$500	\$350	
Greenbelt Cultural Arts Center	Contribution Group	\$34,000	84	\$34,300	\$34,300	
Greenbelt Senior Softball	Contribution Group	\$1,000	47	\$900	\$495	
Greenbelt Soccer Alliance	Recognition Group, grant	\$1,000	77	\$3,000	\$2,580	\$420
Greenbelt Youth Baseball	Contribution Group	\$10,000	75	\$10,000	\$8,600	\$1,400
Subtotal, operating grants		\$79,900		\$78,000	\$72,105	\$2,800
TOTAL		\$82,400		\$87,500	\$81,255	\$3,150
<i>Remaining budget (out of \$81,400):</i>				-6100	145	
<i>Remaining wish list (out of \$12,210, 15%):</i>						9060